On Immigration and Political Correctness

a Marxist critique, 2014–2016 posts

Jørgen Sandemose

Contents

Editor's preface		2
1. Discussion on immigration – its class character	*(January 2014)*	4
2. Rotherham: The writing on the wall	*(September 2014)*	8
3. Racism and unemployment: The coming wrath	*(17 December 2014)*	11
4. Is this what "moderate Islam" is?	*(2015)*	16
5. "Racist" manipulation from the Holocaust Center	*(2015)*	17
6. Repressive tolerance 2015	*(August 2015)*	19
7. Migrants: Foreign classes on stage? [critique of Zizek]	*(October 2015)*	35
8. Xenophobia among immigrants	*(2016)*	38
9. Placebos in various forms: Should there also be a placebo-racism?	*(March 2016)*	42

Editor's preface

This is a translation of a selection of some posts which the Marxist author Jørgen Sandemose (1945–2019) wrote on Verdidebatt – Norway's 'most important online forum for debate about values, religion, beliefs and society' (debate-forum of the newspaper *Vårt Land*). We gave our selection the above title. There are several class-orientated authors who have rejected or criticised the phenomenon of 'anti-racism' or political correctness already. What Sandemose attempts is an orthodox Marxist analysis of immigration and its concrete manifestations. Precisely as an orthodox Marxist, Sandemose opposes Stalinism and its legacy among the left today, as well as the Western interventionist Social Democrats. One can find several important articles of Sandemose online in English, for example 'Welfare Theory: A Critique of Concepts' (2018).

The items we selected here are quite short posts. Only the sixth item, with its title referencing a famous phrase coined by Marcuse ('Repressive tolerance 2015'), has the length of a full article.

There are many books that Sandemose published, since the 1970s, in Norwegian that are original contributions to Marxism. In English he wrote a book-manuscript which is a materialist critique of Hegel, which is yet to be published. We were co-editor with Sandemose of the book *Contributions To A Marxist Theory Of International Trade* (2025, Internet Archive), in which he wrote a chapter on the world market and how differences in economic structures continue to exist between countries. The present selection is our own initiative, as we think the issues still are relevant a decade later.

For access to other posts by Sandemose, outside the topic of this selection (for example on the Greek EU crisis), see:

https://web.archive.org/web/20210516123025/https://www.verdidebatt.no/jonathan?page=1

Before his death, Sandemose wrote his last post there, on June 2019, titled 'Dishonest communists – can they exist?' We quote just its last paragraphs:

"[…] If we take into account that [the Norwegian party] Rødt has already established itself as an opportunistic parliamentary vote-getter, then it is clear that it could get worse! The most terrible thing that this party (and this editorial team) can imagine is to be made a laughingstock. And here the party has more than lived up to the myth that 'communists' are talentless swindlers who cannot be trusted on any occasion. In contrast to slightly more

sensible like-minded people, who have ensured that the staff is in order, and thus actually manage to fool naive liberals (cf. Hagtvet, Braanen et al.) and well-meaning Marxists (cf. Minken, Allern), the fifteen (!) editorial team members have delivered perhaps the most memorable of all Marxian shipwrecks. No one can be fooled by them.

When the legitimate-born parent-generation of *Gnist* and Rødt began their Marx studies around 1970, it was only a short time before a similar waste was a fact. With the help of Mao slogans like "fight the cult of books" (etc.), any input in a Marxist direction within the "Marxist work and study groups" was terrorized away by cadres like Torstein Haldorsen, Ulf Arnesen and Kitty Strand (etc., etc.). As early as 1971, the sectarian organ *Klassekampen* was able to launch the slogan "Close the borders", and have it made into a recognized "communist" slogan. Norwegian workers were gilded as "the ethnically unified part of the working class", while prominent in-spe-AKP members incited against "damn Turks" and against Soviet workers on Spitsbergen. The "international solidarity" that these elements then launched consisted, among other things, of agitating for support for the "fair prices" that Arab bandit regimes demanded for their desert oil.

Why? Yes, because the petty bourgeoisie always chooses the solutions that seem the easiest. Such grotesque results were obtained from it. Note that the official line *Gnist* & Rødt is now taking is the same. In an article in *Klassekampen* on June 17, 2019, Rødt person Boye Ullmann complains that Eastern European workers are "disrupting the labor market" (yes, this is being said by a 'socialist'!), and that the state must therefore intervene.

Today's "Rødt" and its ebullient "*Gnist*" have learned nothing whatsoever. If Marxists do not now intervene in the public debate, anyone can imagine the consequences. Academic Rødt sympathizers have long since declared themselves supporters of political-economic solutions in line with the corporatist currents in state regulatory policy from the 1930s. This is how it has to be, when Marx's theory of value is to be only an "introductory provision".

This parallel is actually not very far-fetched. If a thinking à la Dybedahl can gain ground, it is not just due to the fantasies of secretaries in the corridors of the Federation. For these in turn are academically inspired by half-educated Marxists from philosophical institutes, who are given their exam papers by teachers who are as ignorant of Marx's theories as they themselves are. We will address that next time."

We have used google-translate for the following translations from Norwegian into English. – Noa Rodman, March 2025, Internet Archive.

1. Discussion on immigration – its class character

In the Western labor movement after 1848, there was a clear perception that Asian forms of property and social structures, primarily associated with Russia, were an enemy on a par with Western capitalism.

***

The "classical" period of migration in the early Middle Ages was a cornerstone in the emergence of Western societies. Those who use expressions such as "Islamization" to describe the current situation in the West imagine that similar new formations are on the way. But "Islamization" is just imagination, a notion among immigrants, a consequence of many feeling marginalized in Western societies: A wishful thinking about revenge, without any basis, except among various religious zealots.

Nevertheless, it is striking that the strong cultural divide between "Asians" and "Westerners", as encountered in everyday life in the 21st century, is so blatantly ignored. Likewise, political groups and immigration authorities have grossly overlooked the dangers of ghettoization and mafia-like organization of work and property relations. The problems this creates are accumulated in our days by a prejudiced slander of people who point out cultural differences.

Nevertheless, the fundamental reason for the silence is that liberalism, the ruling ideology in the West, traditionally strives for not only "freedom" but also "equality", without wanting to explain the words seriously. The limitation that characterizes these concepts in their liberal use is also overlooked among socialists, who perceive realistic analyses of differences in social form as a discriminatory activity. Such socialists place themselves in opposition to the ideological basis to which they claim to be committed. Primarily, this leads them to oppose the basis of any Marxism.

In the Western labor movement after 1848, there was a clear perception that Asian forms of property and social structures, primarily associated with Russia, were an enemy on a par with Western capitalism. Contemporary liberals similarly viewed "Asian" forms with principled skepticism, which was related to liberalism's own colonialist, violent practices.

Today, skepticism has taken on a new form, because Western capital's position towards Asian economies is mediated through the market to a much greater extent. The violent aspect has been toned down, and in its urge to secure trade and investment everywhere, capital now tends to prioritize a peaceful, abstract connection of equality, a "cash nexus."

Well-meaning Western intellectuals have swallowed this fact with hook, line and sinker. They have taken the abstract equality of money to be a desired equality between people.

The result is that there is a taboo against analyses of immigration that focus on the cultural basis of immigrant groups. If one is to analyze the European fifth century, no historian will ignore the basic differences between Goths and Romans. For the present, it should be equally central to study the differences between Christianity and oriental religion and ideology.

Socialist movements are responsible for the fact that serious analysis of Asian social forms has been washed away from the West's dirty wallpaper. The traditional interest of Marxists in the topic was stifled by the Stalinist "Communist International", the Comintern. Since Marx had held feudalism to be a prerequisite for the rise of capitalism, while the latter in turn was a historical prerequisite for communism, the Soviet ideologists felt compelled to believe that Russia had had a feudal background. Thus the same had to be said of all Asian areas - including "red" China. Rarely has one heard a more absurd claim, but it is still very much alive among self-proclaimed Marx sympathizers today. They find "feudalism" wherever they turn.

But feudalism grew out of the slave society, which was a strictly European phenomenon. Feudal relations have therefore hardly existed outside Europe. They sprang from the collapse of gang slavery when the landowning classes in post-Roman times had to content themselves with attaching the peasants to a serfdom with de facto tenancy. To this corresponded a relationship of legalized obligations also between nobles – all unknown in Eastern societies, which could (and can) rightly be called “despotic” in terms of relations – governed by arbitrariness. Marx’s realistic assessment of these areas was that they represented an “Asiatic” social formation – where sluggish village collectives with a primitive division of labor from Novgorod to Surabaya [Java] were controlled by large landowners without incentives to streamline production.

The fact that today’s Western society differs so strongly from Eastern ones is due to this difference in historical background.

In today’s immigration debate, we are therefore witnessing the curious consequences of a combination of illiberal liberalism and authoritarian Comintern tradition. Liberalism's friends insist on accepting only abstract similarities, in order to more easily build up a global money circulation, investment chain and commodity circulation, where all products are considered equal, while the modern vassals of the Comintern want to equip this liberalism with a human mask in a disguise for oppressive religions.

Asian religions, especially Islam, are open reflections of societies based on forms of property maintained by direct violence, while Christianity reflects property relations that emerged from a more advanced basis, which led to bourgeois society, with its constant renewal of the productive forces. Both remain expressions of class rule. But Christianity has made the deity a human working force, while Islam has Allah as an inhuman monotheist. Other Asian societies and ideologies are also still today founded on resistance to basic productive change, and clan-based, sectarian violence can have great and lasting significance. Therefore, Islamic extremism has no special basis separate from Islam. Likewise: Certain extreme forms of life, such as e.g. among Roma, has the same general background as that found among exalted Asian mandarins – be it in Lhasa or in Pyongyang.

The perception that wealth in Eastern societies is a given factor that is not expanded through production also contributes to the emigration from Asian countries to capitalist nations in the West. For the most part, these are not proletarian elements, but (in the capitalist sense) unproductive intermediate layers. In his article "Migration Trends from Pakistan", *SPDI Research and New Bulletin*, Vol. 15, no. 3, 2008), Jan Ahmed Maqsood shows that from the 1970s to 2007, migrants from Pakistan sent about 70,000 million dollars back to their home country. There is nothing "morally" objectionable about such cases, but the objective content of them is that Western societies become reservoirs for support for reactionary social systems. Western governments' support for terrorist groups in the past and present is only a minor part of this problem.

For the Western labor movement, this is a major challenge, because if an open discussion is not conducted about these reactionary forms, including their religions, backward ways of thinking about work and property will become more prevalent, also because the Western bourgeoisie wants to use all means to break the work of the trade union movement for orderly relations in the working world.

As a reminder of the difficulties one faces, one can point to the leader of the Socialist Youth, Andreas Halse, who a year ago spoke out against "free labor import", (clearly addressed to Eastern Europeans) which for him means "uncritically bringing in cheap labor who live outside society".

It should be clear to socialists that one of the tasks of the trade union movement is to take care of a proper wage level and to ensure that divisions in the working class are counteracted. Western and Eastern workers are all equally exposed to mutual competition. It is striking that forces around the Socialist Left Party want to stop immigration from foreign working classes, but mobilize an aggressive defense of reactionary social forms that undermine the

class interest of every worker – and an equally aggressive attack on any criticism of religions that dumb down the oppressed.

2. Rotherham: The writing on the wall

This post was published as a feature in *Klassekampen* on September 6.

Rotherham in Yorkshire, in the mid-north of England, is home to a quarter of a million people. The town is a stronghold for Ed Miliband's New Labour. Under normal circumstances, a general election gives three times as many votes to the Social Democrats as to the Conservatives. Immigration, particularly from Pakistan, has been prominent.

The now well-known report presented by Professor Alexis Jay confirms information in the English press recently from Ruzwana Bashir, who grew up near Rotherham, about a culture of concealment within the Pakistani community about child abuse.[1]

But more attention has been paid to the report's claim that nearly 1,500 "white" grand children in the period 1997 to 2013 have been sexually abused and generally degraded in Rotherham, and that all of this could have been prevented through political action. In fact, we know that it is not too much to say that social democratic power has made the atrocities possible. A toxic atmosphere of secrecy has scared people away from exposing a campaign of abuse originating in an Asian environment. People have not dared to take the risk of being branded racist “whistleblowers”. The price may be countless ruined lives. The worst consequences of “political correctness”, which have been warned against on deaf ears for years, are long since reality.

An assessment of the larger context suggests that what has happened may mean the beginning of the end for social democracy as a political force in Europe.

Anyone who reads the Jay Report’s depictions of the conditions of the Rotherham underclass will be hard-pressed to find significant differences between them and sociological and socioeconomic depictions of the so-called “Lazarus classes” in mid-19th-century English factory towns – the lowest strata within the industrial “reserve army”. If a socialist movement is to be conscious of itself and thus of its history, this should be part of the children's lesson. Today we find the same misery as a product not of the nonchalance of Disraeli-Tories or the hypocrisy of Gladstone-Liberals, but of an ignorant arrogance in "New Labour". How did this come about?

Many people consider the social democratic parties in Europe to stand for socialism, but this is clearly wrong. In this sense, a turning point came around 1940, when masses of "socialists"

[1] [See https://www.theguardian.com/society/2014/aug/29/-sp-untold-story-culture-of-shame-ruzwana-bashir]

switched from prioritizing the idea of freedom, and allowed it to be subordinated to a goal of "welfare". At the same time, it was the case that this concept of welfare (in contrast to the concept of freedom) had never had any socialist background. It had started from the utilitarian (i.e. utilitarian) tradition, which in turn was indebted to Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) and Thomas Malthus (1766-1834). In the last century, this direction was primarily defended by the eugenicist J. M. Keynes, who gathered around him a group of socialist economists who were frightened away from the libertarian and revolutionary theory of Marxism.

The utilitarian theorists reacted to the theses of Manchester liberalism about absolute freedom to exploit workers: Jeremy Bentham argued that the freedoms and rights of liberalism were nothing more than a cover for the degradation of working people. The utilitarians originally took this line of thought so far that they opposed concepts of freedom other than those that could be derived from their own theory that man was a being who oriented himself only by reactions to pain and pleasure. Their conclusion was that society had to maximize a quantity of “welfare” or happiness, to the extent that it was possible in a world that was also characterized by pain. Often this would mean that the welfare of some had to be reduced in order for others to be better off. Decisions about this were to be made by utilitarian “experts”. Those who believe they recognize today's "welfare model" as it is dosed [or administered] in economic institutes are not mistaken.

While British business was handed over to liberal capitalists after the Industrial Revolution, utilitarianism took over the tasks that were thus handed over to the state. The utilitarian theorists became planners of infrastructure and - above all - of the treatment of surplus labor. The infamous "workhouses", definitely the most important precursors of concentration camps, were probably the main work of English utilitarianism in the 19th century. There, the unemployed were "corrected" for laziness through adapted doses of pain and pleasure. A good (secondary) example is the Prison Act's requirement that prisoners on a penal diet should never lack drinking water, a welfare good, as they could otherwise easily faint and lose their sense of pain.

This intellectual climate was a necessary part of the background for the so-called "welfare states" in Europe. "Socialism" is no longer a principle of freedom, but of state property and expert rule. Other leading values were and are "orderly conditions" in the enterprises, "tidy" and efficient political leadership, good political "craftsmanship" and "community" without class boundaries. That these are values that, in isolation, are also corporatist, had to be

overlaid with strong and persistent demands for liberalism and “human dignity”. Thus, converts from socialism stood ready to take over the administration of bourgeois society.
Examples from the modern “New Labour” version of this expert power: In Rotherham, three and only three police officers were involved in abuse cases from 2009 to 2012; Police Chief Shaun Wright has been forced to resign from New Labour, but wants to keep his job; Child Welfare removes children from foster parents if it becomes known that these are organised EU opponents and therefore probably “racists”; Labour member Joyce Thacker, who earns one and a half million NOK annually from administering childcare, refuses to resign after the Jay report and blames the parents of spoiled “white girls” for the misery; The nation's deputy children's ombudsman Sue Berelowitz dares to see half the situation as it is, saying that police across the country are practicing "willful blindness". But she also criticizes the idea that the abuses are centered around a particular ethnic group and a particular class.
But this is precisely the case. The bourgeois property system creates, now as before, a special working class with special Lazarus layers. That is capitalist unemployment. This becomes too strong an insight, so the utilitarians close their eyes. But when you close yourself off from understanding one aspect of history, you necessarily also cut yourself off from the historical whole. In this case, you submit to extremist liberalism and deny the obvious fact that the abuses in Rochdale, Rotherham and a hundred other places have originated in cultures, especially Islam, which for centuries have kept people down in ignorance and hatred. But the utilitarians, politically correct as they are, do not understand that a proletarianized Muslim commits atrocities because he himself is religiously and culturally oppressed. Thus, they cannot realize that a conscious and targeted criticism of all religion is a priority task for the real opposition to the existing property relations.
Everything comes to an end sometime. Social democracy has lived a varied life for quite a long time. It is hardly realistic that the movement, in Europe as a whole, can survive the crisis of confidence it has now created through its ignorance, greed and arrogance. A lot can happen when people open their eyes and see the extent of their illusions.

3. Racism and unemployment: The coming wrath

Löfven and other Social Democrats overlook their dark historical present

***

"I will never act in such a way that a neo-fascist single-issue party, which neither respects human inequality nor Sweden's democratic institutions, gains power over the country's development," [Swedish socialist prime] minister Löfven wrote in a debate piece in *Dagens Nyheter* in Stockholm a couple of weeks ago. To consider the Sweden Democrats (SD) as fascist is fine, insofar as the SD is committed to pursuing the labor market policy that in Norway now is allowing the Conservative Party to gain traction. A few months ago, the undersigned sent a request to the SD on its policy regarding trade unions. They never sent a reply. They probably didn't understand the question.

However, Löfven says that he will not even cooperate with the Sweden Democrats, which is inconsistent with the fact that the Social Democrats [SAP] pursue a corporatist labor market policy that has much in common with the classic fascist parties in Italy and Germany. Per Albin Hansson, Swedish Prime Minister for fourteen years in the 1930s and 1940s and a popular social democratic frontman for "Folkhemmet", was a great admirer of Mussolini (and sent him enthusiastic fan mails). This was only reasonable, all things considered: John Maynard Keynes, the English economist who is now a hero and cult figure for the "socialists" around *Klassekampen*, published his main work in Germany in 1936 with a tribute to the Nazi regime in the preface. *Aftenposten*, whose retired cultural editor now heads the Norwegian "Fritt Ord" (though not "Fritt Folk" [*Free People*, fascist paper in WW2]), received crucial press support from the German occupying power and still retains the competitive advantage the newspaper thus gained in the Norwegian media world.

In the autumn of 2011, [Conservative Party member] Åmås put forward some theses "about the new Norway" that would emerge after the July Terror [of Breivik]. Similar to the new arrangement that *Aftenposten*'s German-speaking patrons once proposed, there should be a ban on inciting violence in the media, he made it clear. ("Skutt blir den…" [Shoot..]) When I pointed out to him that this would be the same as opposing any liberation movement anywhere in the world, Åmås fell silent. Like his censorship-friendly teammates Hylland Eriksen, Vetlesen, Bangstad and Ishaq, he pitifully withdrew from the debate. The leadership of the Norwegian Non-Fiction Writers' Association (NFF) has been equally

pitiful, as last year it stopped an application for a scholarship from (at least) one member (the undersigned), after I had criticized the NFF for unknowingly engaging in the same censorship propaganda. The association has now had to pay me a "settlement amount". I hope anyone else who has been subjected to something similar realizes that there is no reason to be condescending to the current NFF leadership in such matters. Active participants have been the not-so-unknown scientist and "interdisciplinary gender researcher" Jørgen Lorentzen (leader of the NFF from 2010 until this spring), current leader and until recently deputy leader Marta Breen, as well as two administrative staff.

The reason why I am providing an introduction that also includes personal experiences after July 2011? It lies in the fact that I assume that a lot of people have been exposed to quite similar things, measured according to each individual's particular circumstances. The incitement against critics of religion (e.g. Islam) has confirmed the revolutionary potential of Karl Marx's remark that all criticism must begin as criticism of religion. The social quasi-intellectual elite (the clearest symbolic figure: Hylland Eriksen) has felt threatened by a criticism that simultaneously arose in circles beyond itself – in internet discussions not least. It has thus feared that a social underclass would give it competition for attention – much like when elitists in Western Europe after the First World War seriously began to fear the working class, or when elitist intellectuals in the early 1960s showed anxiety about the spread of television in the Scandinavian countries.

The point now is: What kind of mass contempt is this really?

The contempt seems absolute – the opponents are not only perceived as "other" in relation to the elitists themselves; rather, the latter perceive the masses as the very Other personified, which is "Other" in itself, regardless of who they are viewed by.

The undersigned, who is supposedly not only an Islamophobe but also a Marxophile, since I constantly think I see things in Karl Marx's production that are unjustly overlooked, believes he finds this otherness depicted in Marx's depiction of the "industrial reserve army" from the 1850s. Or rather, in the population that formed and is forming below the layer of ordinary unemployed, i.e. of the most disadvantaged within the regular "army".

Marx described this lower stratum by combining proper names such as "Lazarus" and "Pauperismus" (i.e. the inter-European word for "poverty") and concepts that described the "dead weight" that characterized the industrial reserve army: "Pauperism is the hospital of the active labour-army and the dead weight of the industrial reserve army," he wrote in his chapter [twenty-five] on "The General Law of Capitalist Accumulation" in the first volume of *Capital*.

This implies the claim that capitalist-produced unemployment brings with it the production of a layer of mental and physical incapacitated workers within the sphere of pauperism and dehumanization. According to this theory, capitalist unemployment is far from simply the production of general "poverty" or of a "poverty problem," as it is called in the velvet language heard on both the right and the left. On the contrary, it is a dynamic system with several bottom bulkheads and dead weights. And for a certain, large minority it creates lifelong misery.

A couple of months ago I addressed the misery of the population (Asian and Western) in English places like Rotherham, Rochdale and others in an article in *Klassekampen*, which I later submitted to Verdidebatt. Today I could add the revelations from the Bristol area, which is currently less well-known because the results of a legal investigation have not been presented. The social catastrophe, with the destruction of minors, murder and suicide in youth groups, religious bigotry and spirals of mutual contempt and self-loathing, is almost confusingly reminiscent of Marx's illustrations of conditions in the industrial centers of Central England a century and a half ago. With today's acute production crisis in the Western world, which has lasted since late 2007, it was no different.

If, for the sake of illustration, we concentrate on what is happening and has been happening in Rotherham, the restraint has been striking in the Scandinavian media. Perhaps this relative silence has to do with the fact that the politically correct, like some responsible people in the British poor system, actually blame the ruined Rotherham girls themselves, or their guardians?

It is true that the children in Rotherham were caught in a disaster even independently of their contact with Asian "groomers". But this also makes it less tempting for the right wing (here at home or in Britain) to use them as examples in their immigration-skeptical agitation. For "Rotherham" (the word should become a term) shows us first and foremost the moral collapse of the liberal model of society.

The counterpart to the latter model is the real historical capitalist society. Therefore, it is the case that the industrial reserve army, and also its lower strata, have in practice grown out of population strata that were present in pre-capitalist society; poverty under European feudalism, black people from the slave economy in the United States, discriminated women from high and low population groups everywhere on the globe, and more. These were, after the breakthrough of capitalism and periodic mass unemployment, developed into "strangers", "Others" for the system, but at the same time within the system. They are despised by intellectual socialists as much as by the velvet rope. Everyone could benefit from

remembering a few stanzas from Nils Ferlin's poem "Barfotabarn" [Barefoot children] from 1933:

But these seriously poor
it hurts me to see them.
They never get a loaf of bread from the Salvation Army
and never a word in *Clarté*.

The example from the United States is particularly informative. This is perhaps the only case of a nation where an advanced capitalist system has developed with a traditional slave population. In percentage terms, the proportion of unemployed people here over time is twice as high among blacks as among whites. At the same time, it is difficult to see that the condescending attitude of other sections of the population towards blacks as a group is different from, for example, the attitude of wealthy Europeans towards the worst-off "Lazarus classes" of the working population on their own continent. The traditional "white" attitude towards blacks is essentially the same as the traditional attitude towards the lost classes within European and American "pauperism". This tendency is indeed strengthened by the traditional resistance of many blacks to capitalist forms of organization. But these are nothing more than national peculiarities, which exist in every country with a capitalist economy. In Britain, it was and is the Irish who were placed at the bottom of the pecking order, and who united defensively in Catholic backwardness.

On the other hand, the sheer size of the black reserve army has led to an interest in racial questions that has obscured the essentials of the matter. We have even experienced that Jan Hårstad, until recently a sober revolutionary, views rebellions in the black population of the United States as if they were the result of ethnic characteristics and religious (Muslim?) obstinacy. Such views are in danger of entering into alliance with thinkers such as the sociologists Ottar Brox and Sigurd Skirbekk, who clearly operate with racist components in their "analyses".

A similar risk is run by Ole Jørgen Anfindsen, who has so far avoided being labeled a racist from serious quarters. He is interested in so-called intelligence analyses, and has not understood their function. When he takes "intelligence research" seriously, it is still in the belief that they represent a scientifically serious position. But as the debate with such "scientists" progresses, in step with the misery of the labor market, it will become more and more clear to everyone that these scientists do not reflect on the social position of the people

they declare to be sub-intelligent. Gradually, it will become clear to everyone that what they are really investigating is not racial affiliation, but affiliation with the reserve army and pauperism. At the same time, these scientists themselves may realize that the human capacity for reflection, which they must admit in advance is basically the same in every individual of the species, breaks down any attempt to measure “intelligence” regardless of social position. It is important to read not only Marx, but also his idealist predecessors, from Kant to Hegel!

4. Is this what “moderate Islam” is?

A quote from the NRK [Norwegian Broadcasting Corporation] website recently: “The most prestigious educational institution within Sunni Islam advocates that members of the terrorist group IS should be “killed, crucified and have their limbs cut off”.

The statement came from “the Cairo-based Al Azhar … after IS [Islamic State] burned a captured Jordanian pilot, NRK continues.

Here we do not hear much about “Vengeance belongs to me, says the Lord”, in the Christian sense of the expression.

During the Breivik case, the Norwegian-Pakistani lawyer Abid Raja stated that the civil criminal law principle included a revenge motivation. The undersigned is glad not to have heard anything similar from other Norwegian lawyers.

The logical consequences of the principle of revenge were seen when Jordan, as a natural consequence, responded by immediately executing two Islamist prisoners.

It was Grand Sheikh Ahmed al-Tayebs who spoke from the Al-Azhar “university”, a thousand-year-old command post for Islamic religious authority. Listen again: The murderers deserved to be “killed, crucified or have their limbs amputated”.

Is this what is called “moderate Islam”? A closer look at press reports seems to show that it is the method of execution in particular that religious authorities have reacted to.

It is reported that the Saudi scribe Salman al-Odah has clarified on Twitter that “only Allah torments with fire”. So the fault with IS is that the group is blasphemous?

This is the type of social analysis that flourishes at the level of Muslim culture.

The background is clear enough: This is what happens when a religion based on the need to unite an expanding desert people is allowed to continue to exist as an organizational form among settled [sedentary] masters and slaves. The original horror images are retained, and they are now aimed at the working population, who will never be able to let go of the image of corporal punishment that awaits them if they fail their earthly masters and their legal advisors of various kinds.

In fact, it seems that even Islam-critical circles in the West have not seen the main point here. They are certainly all too happy that Isis is being threatened.

5. “Racist” manipulation from the Holocaust Center

Islamophobia theories are increasingly becoming more and more amusing. Let’s look at a new one.

In Dagbladet.no on March 19, “senior researcher” Cora Alexa Døving at the Holocaust [HL] Center claims the following:

> “The categories I refer to in relation to racism are linked to forms of origin, be it ethnic origin, geographical, cultural or religious. Claiming that an individual’s mentality and human dignity are linked to such broad category affiliations is fundamental to racist thinking. The idea that “Muslims” act and think in specific and unchangeable ways is a gross generalization and when this is also used as an argument for discrimination, it is racism.”

Døving is a textbook example of demagogic and manipulative argumentation. First of all: It is a sly thing to put the relationship between “mentality” and “human dignity” on the same line here. Reducing the human dignity of a person of Muslim faith is an abomination, which only a few would think of. To claim that a person’s mentality on average is characterized by a certain religiosity is something quite different, and a completely reasonable thought. What is religiosity, other than an obsessive thinking, which varies in negative strength from religion to religion?

To claim that such an assessment of Muslims’ “mentality”, in the sense of the mentality that naturally arises from the religion of Islam, is an expression of “racism”, is simply absurd. It is connected to the fact that Døving is looking to redefine “racism” so that she can take advantage of the disgust most people have towards this phenomenon, to slander other viewpoints she does not like.

What are the criteria for being employed as a researcher at the Holocaust Center?

There is a pastoral tone in Døving's post: She assures that she does not regard religion-criticism as an expression of racism. This claim is definitely not true, because when one criticizes religion, it is of course to combat the negative consequences of the religious mentality.

Døving also writes: “Racism is attributing negative character traits to people based on their belonging to a category, and allowing this to legitimize their subordination.”

Since Døving's post aims to present it as a “research result” that racism is not linked to the racial phenomenon (get out of here!), would mean that distancing oneself from a class, for example the petty bourgeoisie, because of the property relationship its individuals have with the means of production, is the same as “subordinating” these individuals, and treating them “racist”.

Thus, it seems that the HL Center would approve of a general breakdown of all common concepts in social theories. All social science would be dissolved. So once again: What is the criterion for employment at the HL center: Non-science?

6. Repressive Tolerance 2015

It seems easy to deliver frivolous criticism of Hege Storhaug [she is known as a critic of Islamic cultural practice, and co-manages the Human Rights Services in Oslo]. The question is whether it is not even easier to dissect it [in its turn]. All you have to do is try to act objectively. It takes little more.

> A debate about a proposal by Hege Storhaug appeared on Verdidebatt some time ago. During this discussion, one of the participants brought up an article in the journal *Agora*, by Frode Helland at the so-called "Ibsen Center" [he is a professor of literature].
> The debater claimed that Helland had nicely criticized Storhaug's alleged manipulation of language, her implicit propaganda, and so on.
> The matter surprised me somewhat, as I am familiar with experts pointing out the weaknesses of Helland's postmodernist speech about Ibsen's texts. After posting a comment on Verdidebatt, I therefore turned to Helland's article. I found it so startlingly weak, and logically so far down, that I wrote a critique of it and sent it to Agora, where Helland himself is the editor.
> The critique took the form of an article, which I am now printing here at Verdidebatt, since it was refused entry into *Agora* without justification. It is "scientifically" equipped, even with footnotes. But still. I am making the attempt. Sorry, but I have to.

Repressive tolerance 2015

The magazine *Agora* printed in its no. 3-4 for 2014, with Frode Helland and Geir O. Rønning as editors, an article by Frode Helland, "Rasism without racists in Norway" (pp. 108-143). It is worth commenting on.[1]

Islamophilia and the like

The title of the article is obviously intended to reflect Helland's description of his own political efforts, as given at the beginning of the text: The author claims that he himself has

experienced that it is problematic, indeed "extremely difficult", to combat racist speech, because people feel "grossly offended" by hearing that what they "have just said was racist" (108).

This is strange reading material, when Helland claims that it is a question of a recognition gained through "own experience", while he conspicuously fails to open up the possibility that the cases in question are due to failing judgment on his own part. How is the reader supposed to know anything about that side of the matter? We shall soon see that Helland's concept of "racism" gives us a difficult matter in our hands. This will become all the more difficult to specify when such examples are brought forward as "experience", i.e. "empiricism" in a scientifically relevant sense.

This objection is appropriate because in Norway there are entire institutions – perhaps primarily FAFO [Institute for Work and Welfare Research], whose connection with the trade union is more peculiar than beneficial – that seriously perceive conversational activities towards Muslims (and others) as a sufficient basis in itself for drawing conclusions about the partners' general perceptions and actual positions. The concept of "empiricism" has acquired a dubious meaning among such research groups, and the tendency is spreading, something that Helland's theoretical contribution is also a sign of.

In this connection, it should be pointed out how Helland uses a large part of his "analysis" (his own expression) to criticize the forms of presentation in the NRK program "Brainwashing" (cf. pp. 132-141); this part of his article lacks credibility and seriousness to a certain extent, because it is built on the author's own interpretations of sound, mimicry and implication regarding what is shown on the screen. All of this is of course uncontrollable and rather contributes to a suspicion of scholarly immaturity. The critical reader will inevitably wonder whether Helland wants a reading public with the same limited epistemic possibilities as those we find among the chained citizens in front of the shadow screen at the very back of Plato's cave.

Having made these critical remarks, it is worth emphasizing that Helland, in a previous section (pp. 116-128), where the phrase "Hege Storhaug (HRS)" is included in the inconsiderate title, has formulated clearly relevant points against the views of the organization Human Rights Service [founded in 2001], especially in Storhaug's texts. In this form, Helland clearly highlights the problematic nature of the HRS project, which in practice unilaterally emphasizes "Western values", insofar as they are based on attitudes in the bourgeois class, versus the Islamic way of thinking. He rightly points out critically that Western imperialism contributes to exploitation and killing sprees against Muslim

populations, and implies that “Western values” as such hardly have better characteristics than this. But he completely omits Islam’s own role in this regard, and reveals – something we will return to – a critical need to read up on world history.[2] A striking example is his remark that “relatives of the victims of the US-backed genocide in Indonesia under Suharto ... have good reasons to disagree” with HRS’s views.

Critical to the political direction Helland stands for is that even the word “genocide” is now being used in several connections is used for opportunistic-embellishment purposes. (Cf. the dispute in the UN Security Council about the killings in Srebrenica, NRK's dubious language, etc.) Furthermore: The 'US-supported' actions that took place in Indonesia in 1965-66, events that first gradually brought Suharto to power, were not a "genocide", but political massacres of members of the communist party PKI and their families - to the extent of about half a million people. Most of the killings were carried out as Islamic jihad murders, and legitimized as such by Muslim murder gangs.

That Islam, like the Pentagon, is a mortal enemy of popular-collective forms of property that the PKI agitated for, should be indisputable. They would be the beginning of the end for Muslim autocracy - the coercion of the masses against themselves, i.e. the person-based legitimization of the power of the landowners over these individuals themselves. The central thing with regard to Helland's article, however, is whether the author will make any attempt to understand the basis of Islam. Seen from a Marxist perspective – a basis Agora in earlier times attempted to surf on – for example, Islam, like every religion above the level of natural religions, is a functionally effective mental system of oppression. There is no space here to go into the ideological structure of this phenomenon.[3]

On the other hand, it is probably the case that Helland's work not only (I) systematically overlooks the basic function of Islam, but also (II) the positive effect for "Western imperialism" that lies in his own attitude.

As for (I), his article is characterized by a complete absence of analysis of the basis of Islam, let alone knowledge of it. The difficulties he creates for himself become apparent in the following passages:

> It is beyond doubt that Storhaug promotes an essentialist view of Muslims, understood as a unified group. We are therefore talking about something other than religious criticism [!] or criticism of certain actions of some individuals, what she promotes is a view of Muslims and Islam as such, “indiscriminate” and essentialist. In addition, Storhaug has the important point that her elaboration of the negative

> features of Islam appears to be unchangeable; the main problem for both culture and individual lies, according to Storhaug, in what she calls the "fixed relationship to Islam and Sharia" (124).

It is "undoubtedly" that Helland has poor language, and writes unclearly, especially when problematic points are to be addressed. The reader will see that it is impossible here to clearly distinguish between what is the author's view or his own terms (cf. e.g. "negative features") or to clarify the relationship between verbs and adjectives ("elaboration"/"unchangeable"), and so on. Moreover, a distinction is assumed here between "religious criticism" and claims about a religious "essence" – which would precisely make the former meaningless as a research discipline. With a polemical example: What does Helland mean by "the negative features of Islam", if it is not implied that this is a core phenomenon (or something else), namely an aspect of Islam "as such"? And how is this implication related to the fact that he, on the other hand, does not describe any such core? And why does he not give the necessary summary of what Storhaug understands by 'relationship between Islam and Sharia'?

A characteristic occurrence is found when Helland writes: "Is there a unified "Muslim world"? Of course not," with the continuation: "...The religion of Islam is thus presented [by HS, edited by JS] as an undifferentiated, unified entity" (118).

Now it is clear that if it is first assumed that there is a "Muslim world", then a unity is also implied which implies that a "Muslim" unity exists. What Helland can therefore be said to be asking is whether this world is unified. And of course it is true that it is not – at least directly. The very question shows that whoever has set it up is now beyond the unified idea, and wants to explore its content. The structure that one might then find presents itself, so to speak, as an open horizon. One can find unity as well as division within it. But in any case, as long as one continues to use what Plato called the 'simulation', here "Muslim", one maintains a unity, and not any difference.

In Helland we thus find reproduced the most elementary, and very frequently occurring, methodological blunder in what we can call the Islamophile literature, namely the absence of a definition (or an adequate substitute for it) of what is being debated. Helland's article is academically unstable for this reason alone. He should be obliged to explain his starting concept, e.g. by means of a juxtaposition, such as an explanation of the distinction between Islam and Christianity. Because he perhaps believes that the phenomenon of "Christianity" *means* something and has an essence?

Islamophilia is imperialism-apology

It also gets worse when Helland adds that the religious “part of Muslim life is reinforced in the text so that it constitutes the essence to which all Muslims are reduced” (118). When he finds this to be critizable without further ado, it must mean that he perceives a religious element as a “part” that in practice has the same position in every religious individual, and in relation to every religion. But such a direct comparison absolutely presupposes that Helland defines Islam. Otherwise, it is not possible to refer to this religion as a “part” of anything. Regarding the “part” he then says that it “in practice can be large or small” (as if it were an appendix he was considering). It “does not just stand for the whole, it is the whole”, he adds with an unexplained and rather mysterious sentence, and allows this to turn into an incomprehensible criticism of Storhaug. There is much to suggest that both words and concepts have been omitted here, perhaps both typographically and epistemically. It is not very fruitful to present this confusion in a finished product.

In addition, Helland nowhere makes an assessment of the differences that each individual religion presents in relation to its own possible development towards secularity. Or in other words: The extent to which a religion can contribute to its own abolition is not considered. (This is probably one reason why the relationship between Islam and Christianity [which itself develops secularity] is avoided in his “analysis”.) Against Helland, it must be emphasized that it is unrealistic to perceive a religion as a “part” of a human life, among other things because a religion must be defined as integrated organically into the life that is then lived. If such an organic dimension does not exist, the person is not religious.

Helland’s main problem is well illustrated by the fact that all of the last-mentioned aspects are simply satisfactorily treated or implied in Storhaug, while he himself has not reflected on them. But Helland's silence on the "essential question" has negative consequences even where he reaches a justified criticism of "Islamophobia" (an alleged phenomenon, which he also does not define). For example, he can be praised for emphasizing (cf. 126) Unni Wikan's point out of the multicultural aspect of honor killings (not monopolized by Muslims); but firstly, he does not exploit this to place all such killing practices in a general cultural and religious context (which could have provided the missing historical clarification of an entire type of religions, or of the relationship to Christianity); secondly, he overlooks that he thereby presupposes an Islamic "core", which is therefore exempt from "something" (here:

honor killing). The entire article is riddled with dogmatic assumptions, even where a rational analysis could have been the result.

As mentioned before (and to briefly transfer Helland's techniques to the language he takes the liberty of using against others), we can say that he stands for an Islamophile tendency to caress the world's most violent-repressive religion. As indicated earlier, this also has a direct positive effect on the Western imperialism he claims to oppose. We are thus in what we called (II), above. For the aforementioned imperialism is based on free competition and the theoretical basis of liberalism. The progress-friendly aspect of all capitalism, and its provision of (the de facto religiously formulated) human rights, is its own most genuine product. But this requires that in the long term theses about the common equality of humans must prevail, albeit precisely in a contradictory way. It is inconceivable that there can be a truly long-term imperialist division of labor between capitalist powers, without their populations being disciplined to accept respect for common humanity. But as said, this will always take place in a contradictory manner. Experience shows that it happens in a discriminatory way: the principle of feminism and gender quotas on a new scale: 'These people have the right to what they want, no matter what'. The discrimination takes the form of entire populations being exempted from analysis and historical understanding, which radically bogs down the intellectual level of universities and schools worldwide. Helland's academic delusions are unfortunately a direct typical example. They help to turn the world's population into billions of free and equal, commodity-owning circulation points in the movement of capital. To maintain such illusions, the bourgeoisie depends on the destruction of all approaches to a "materialist conception of history". And it gets the help it needs: As usual, hackademia places itself at the service of capital's need for a market.

All this confirms the main tendency in Herbert Marcuse's theses about repressive tolerance and its system-maintaining function. Can one find a more striking confirmation of the capitulation of so-called left-wing intellectuals, as well as their inability to recognize the lice of capital in their tracks?

Of course you can. Don't despair! It is true that nothing can be more tragic than reality, but nothing can be more comical, either. As we shall see, Helland himself is an active promoter of pseudoscientific racism. Let us first take up for a moment his remarks about "Brainwashing":

> "This NRK program arouses interest because it shows with all possible clarity how racial constructions are included in political projects. Several of those interviewed

> stand for a polished form of eugenics, i.e. racial hygiene, and they were allowed to present clearly racist positions, disguised as science, almost unchallenged" (141).

It is quite reasonable that a convinced liberal - like Helland - would like to distance himself from eugenics. But does he really have the freedom to do so? How effective are liberal freedoms really in our time?

First, to the core of today's historical situation. The fact is that liberalism, since new modes of production contributed to its transformation in the 19th century, merged with British utilitarianism, so that the liberals strengthened their position in civil society, while state posts were generally reserved for utilitarians, who had their main base in the British Labour Party and in similar “social democratic” institutions, to finally function as pillars of national university systems. The parties regularly scolded (and scold) each other, as is usual between Siamese twins who pull at each other. And is it not unreasonable that the idea of eugenics should emerge among siblings in such a situation.

So when the world crisis came in 1929, everything was ready for bourgeois acceptance of J.M. Keynes – the upper-class economist, the vulgarist, and the liberalist&utilitarian in one flesh; Keynes adopted (rather: plagiarized) the famous monetary theory of Silvio Gesell (1862-1930), which in short amounted to the following vulgarity: The existence of money gives goods value and ensures that every good can be said to have a rate of interest.[4]

In other words: Karl Marx had opposed vulgar economics by claiming that it is not money that makes goods commensurable, but conversely, the commonality of goods that makes the existence of money possible. Since this commonality can only be the performance of human labor, working people, a working class, become the central point of the system. This only rational starting point for the economy was now denied with a modern variant of Proudhonism: Money is the source of the economic All, claim Gesell and Keynes. The road is short to the fascistic variant of the theory of “finance capitalism”.

But the crux of the matter is that the collapse of liberalism's credibility (demonstrated, then as now, by the world crisis itself) had to lead towards a different theoretical paradigm than the comfortable equilibrium theory from the tradition of Alfred Marshall (1842-1924) and his colleagues. And the major modification within liberalism could not result in any real new theory, but became a return to the dogmas of Thomas Robert Malthus (1766-1834), with his emphasis on population theory and thus also on eugenic principles. The economy was now, through various welfare theories, seen as founded on certain biological facts. From this it was a short step to once again prioritizing the welfare of the working class, and now in a way

that could make knowledge-hungry socialists imagine that Marx's theory was once again becoming relevant - precisely at the same time that the opposite was the case.

Keynes was an ardent eugenicist, and his entire school, right up to the present day, would deserve to be called racist, if one were to adhere to the criteria for the use of terms that Helland and his associates operate with.[5] But consistency is not the latter's strong point.

It was no coincidence that liberalism merged Siamesely into biological utilitarianism. On the contrary, it was a matter of necessity, insofar as liberalism, via David Ricardo (1772-1823), had arisen as an internal reaction against Malthusian population theory. Ricardo's proof that the prices of goods could not depend on the wages workers received (but instead on the working hours spent in production) resulted in Malthus's theory that the size of the working population was an independent and determining variable in the economy being rejected. Thus, liberalism could claim that the working population did not need any form of welfare or regulation.

When world crises arise, however, the danger of revolution becomes so clear that such ideas are rejected by the bourgeoisie, no matter how absurd theories this class uses to justify its friendliness to workers. Gesell's theories are appropriate. Ricardo's as well as Marx's labor theory of value is turned on its head, and the ideological basis for an economy based on biological, and therefore possibly also racial, relations is revealed. In practice, these theories are understood today, where Nazism and the subsequent racial theoretical excesses are well known, simply as population theories, which, like the early utilitarians, prioritize the welfare and happiness of human beings, a tender form of eugenics, and do not easily break with the influence of liberalism's friendliness to humanity. The fatal basis is there in any case.

This thinking has been presented in Norway by “left” theorists such as Lars Gunnesdal, Rune Skarstein, Magnus Marsdal, Arne Overrein, Bjørgulv Braanen, Hans Ebbing, Lars Borgersrud, Anton Hellesøy and others for a long time now. Here, too, an uneducated front has been formed, where the slogan in practice has been to silence Marxist criticism. Prominent in this connection is precisely Helland’s journal *Agora*, which has even printed a “theoretical” article by Rune Skarstein on ‘Keynes’ revolutionary monetary theory’ and the like.[6] In today’s intellectual climate in the West, attempts to reconcile this vulgar economics with a broader methodological perspective take as their starting point Jacques Derrida’s misunderstandings of Hegel and Marx: Hegel’s analysis of the *productive* consumption of the thing within the Master-Servant analysis is interpreted by Derrida as *consumptive* consumption; This starting point is continued by Slavoj Zizek, who transforms Marx's theory of value-creating labor into a pure theory of individual satisfaction, i.e.

adapted to the marginal utility theory's application of Gesell's thinking. *Agora* has been very busy propagating these views. A perfect equivalent can be found, precisely in *Agora*, in a presentation of Maurizio Lazzarato's *La fabrique de l'homme endetté*, edited by Roar Høstaker, "The Indebted Man",[7] where Marx's theory of absolute ground rent is turned on its head by calling the interest a "surplus value" [sic!] and perceived as a general monopoly price depending on the random desire for money of wealthy individuals. Thus, Marx's theory is attempted to be applied at both ends, first in the introductory commodity analysis, then in the confirmation of the theory of value in the endpoint of capital in the historically original land property.[8]

It is probably clear that Helland does not actually see the unity between the racist theories he eagerly propagates in his journal, and the basis that might exist for racist-connoted attempts at science in Norway or in the Western world as a whole. But the contradiction in Helland's position becomes all the more clear. The forms of thought that can actively produce racism within so-called science today are hardly to be found elsewhere than in the "left's" favorite Keynesian theme.

Methodological: "Racism" as all-encompassing Nothing

Helland spends a lot of space trying to provide a definition of “racism”, to an extent that is quite striking considering that the main concept “Islam” is not defined at all. When it comes to this concept of racism, the difficulty lies rather in Helland’s particular argument for introducing it.

The article begins by saying:

> “One should be careful not to operate with a concept of racism that is all-encompassing, but it is equally important to avoid a definition that is so narrow that the phenomenon [!] disappears into extremely small circles of neo-Nazis and racial hygienists” (109).

Given Helland’s own negative attitudes towards the “phenomenon” (a phenomenon that is thus assumed to be known in advance), surely it would only be desirable if the scope of the concept were minimal? The article does not provide any justification whatsoever for not operating with a definition that in practice is restricted to “neo-Nazis and racial hygienists”

(which are connected to social phenomena that Helland also claims to be fully aware of in this case).
It should be clear that already against such a background, it can be perceived as criticism when Helland uses expressions such as “investigation” and “analysis” about his text. It is rather a thoughtless piece of agitation. It takes on directly embarrassing dimensions when Helland, about a certain “obvious Islamophobia”, states the following:

> “Even if the word race does not play any role here, I would say that this form of Islamophobia is racist because it portrays Muslims as one unified and hostile group, a group that must be kept down and discriminated against [sic!], because otherwise they will try to take over society and oppress us, the majority population” (114).

Let’s look at some possible parallel examples.

1) What distinguishes the mentality Helland outlines from the attitude that must have characterized the participants in a popular front against Nazism in Germany in the period 1928-1945, especially their relationship with members of the NSDAP? Are there racist implications here?
2) Is it to be understood that McCarthyism in the USA in the early 1950s was by definition racist in its agitation against “communists”?
3) Did the Spanish Republicans stand for racism in their fight against fascism?
4) The most useful example is of course one that involves social conflicts of a very basic nature, such as in the Marxist theory of classes. The relationship between members of antagonistic classes would, by Helland’s standards, mean that all individuals with the appropriate class affiliation would be accused of being potential or actual “racists”.

The author’s emphasis on the importance of avoiding a definition in the direction of the “all-encompassing” comes here in the strange light that it deserves from the outset. In her article, Helland places great emphasis on the critical work that has recently been carried out by Cora Alexandra Døving at the so-called Holocaust Center (financed, among other things, by a religious institution). What she has delivered also ends up in precisely the same sandpit: In practice, an agitation is being put forward here that prohibits a Marxist way of thinking, and which will consequently lead to a scientific theory of revolution being made punishable

under some racism section. The best that can be said about Døvik/Helland's work is that it is not well thought out.

A productive wage worker, and likewise a capitalist, is perceived in Marxian theory as a person who ultimately has a very specific worldview, and very specific and specific forms of experience, all resulting from his position in relation to the means of production, and who at the same time can act collectively in directions determined by the same relationship. If Marxian theories are to have any historiographical value at all, the same applies in principle to any mode of production, including the “Asian” one, which is based on a village system where a slow caste-based division of labor was originally developed and gradually spread to urban areas and national institutions.[9] (Hege Storhaug's emphasis on the “village” as a determining factor for Central Asian immigrants, including to village-less Norway, is thus correct in principle, and appears to be misunderstood by Helland in concrete polemics throughout the article.)

Now it is clear that it would be foolish to claim that Marxism is a theory that “discriminates” between workers and capitalists, even though it of course implies that both groups are mentally shaped or determined by structures tied to the material wealth of society (e.g. property or propertylessness), without thereby being without the possibility of freeing themselves from this binding. At the same time, it is equally clear that it would be very difficult to oppose the possibility that such a restriction actually applies to them, and has an influence on their individual intellectual achievements.

Just as certain as these possibilities are in every way theoretically legitimate, it is that one can perceive a religion as a superstructure over a system, which by its own power legitimizes the latter. When Storhaug or others focus on the inertia of ways of thinking, especially those that accompany a believing attitude towards Islam, a Marxist would consider it a fairly adequate description of the consequences of the historical stagnation that Marx and others attributed to “Asiatic” societies. It should not be surprising that a cultural background was allowed to dominate in an immigrant life. One main reason will be visible among all the vicious circles that a mutual skepticism between immigrants and a more original population creates. The essential thing, however, is that in this case there is a mental confrontation between different modes of production.

If we think a little about the possible mental defense mechanisms that can characterize immigrant Muslims, even the strange "Eurabia" or "caliphate" myth is put in a different light than what we glimpse in Helland and his like-minded people. The undersigned has had "conversations" with Muslims, in workplaces, schools and in cities and rural areas, in a

number that perhaps exceeds that of many a "researcher". I have *never* encountered a Muslim, regardless of social status, who does not have a mark of anti-Semitism. (I have ruthlessly treated the masses as guinea pigs and managed to discreetly bring the issue to the fore!) And I have *often* encountered "caliphate" thinking. However, I have rarely been able to take all of this to express personally felt aggression. Muslims (like Hindus) unfortunately often suffer from feelings of inferiority (cf. the backward "Asian" economy), and are therefore interested in marking an ideologically justified distance from Western people. This often manifests itself in arrogance, which "sneak Islamization" ideologists notice and misunderstand. Another issue is that as long as the individual Muslim so often feels the need to hide behind this gossip, it becomes relatively easy to arrange fronts that actually take themselves and such slogans seriously – as happens when Western Muslim youth choose to join IS.

Let us conclude this section with a cross-reference: It is an important point for Helland to emphasize that and how "we live in a world that is globally and locally systematically racist" (142). Who can accept this central conclusion in an article that frankly misunderstands every concept of defining the subject? Isn't it the case that the concept of racism is being washed out with the lukewarm bathwater, while at the same time becoming precisely as "all-encompassing" as Helland has warned about? What is not defined can - by definition! - be used anywhere.

Helland's unspoken technique of domination

The untenable attempt at a definition of racism that characterizes Helland's presentation is in reality a thinly stated farewell to all social science and to the use of general concepts in broad fields. Postmodernism and "textualization" take over. One has to ask oneself whether Døving and Helland have made serious attempts to think through the consequences of their position. But never so bad that it is not good for anything: One untenability kills the other. For when Helland opens his criticism of HRS (cf. 116) with a despicable remark about his opponent ("many would probably argue that Hege Storhaug is too extreme to be taken seriously"), he leaves the reader free to emphasize without many inhibitions how absurd his own ruling position actually is.

Helland, who in his article places great emphasis on criticizing 'Islamophobes' – and Storhaug in particular – for misuse of language (in favor of a sneaky argument for racist

attitudes), is obviously not immune to this for himself. Perhaps the worst example we saw above. The second worst is probably the following "summary" of Storhaug's position:

> "Islam cannot be reconciled with "Norway", among other things because Muslims in their "nature" are faithful to the text, bound to the letter of the religion. And when Storhaug then sets out about these "fundamental elements", much of the argument is based on rhetorical devices that we have already described,..." (122).

Let it be said that the expression "natural" is not used by Storhaug at all on any similar occasion in the book. It is one thing for Helland to perceive Storhaug in such a way that it would be "natural" to use "natural", it is quite another to formulate oneself in such a way that the reader may involuntarily suspect plagiarism.

It may seem that Helland uses linguistic, or rather perfidious and unlinguistic, techniques of domination in such a way that he expects to have convinced the reader that Storhaug identifies "Islam" with "every single Muslim", and can therefore freely accuse her of personal attacks on one and a half billion Muslims. In reality, his logic is flawed, and is simply a product of his postmodern perception of general concepts. In this way, Helland wants to have a number of arguments about Islam's negative role in bourgeois societies dismissed. However, it is important to expose such inaccuracies, because they are most often ways of thinking that are implicit in Muslim societies – such as tendencies to accept tax fraud and the like; one would have to be childish not to accept that Islam encourages actions of this type, especially in infidel environments, and that this has a self-evident background in old and surviving modes of production.

It seems as if Helland completely forgets – or deliberately omits – that his "Islamophobic" opponents largely perceive Islam as a system of oppression where the ordinary woman & man – "the simple Muslim" – is the first victim. According to this, Islam is a violence-based religion whose function is primarily expressed in the physical threat against the working classes and groups – with the caliph and his barbaric hirelings as the foremost threat, and carnally sealed in the worst way via ritual abuse of the female gender.

It is thus a complete distortion of Helland's serious opponents that is expressed in the following attempt at irony:

> “It is not specific and complex political and historical power relations that underlie social problems in these parts of the world; here it is only a question of culture as an explanation” (125-126).

With a slightly greater interest in historical matters, Helland would probably have discovered that he would have to generalize also when it comes to power relations, both political and mediated, and violent and unmediated. There are different historical systems, and each has its own particular exercise of power, or also its particular exercise of violence. (Would he have used the same argument against Marx's thesis that changes in Asian societies will have to come "from outside"? He should definitely think that the thesis was no less deserving of criticism than Storhaug's.)
Let us look at a comprehensive and comprehensive example of primitive argumentation and lack of language in the following (120-121), where Helland pretends to create a factual and critical combination of a summary and a quote from Storhaug's discussion of structural problems related to certain immigrant groups. He writes:

> “And again, these problems cannot be solved by integration into work and education, because “politicians with close ties to extended families and ethnic environments characterized by a feudal caste and clan culture, can hardly act with independent opinions detached from the power structures they are born into” (...). No representative of this minority can have their own opinions, they are “born into” the cultural constraints that make them dishonest, ...”

Some brief comments on this:
1) the word “representative” will be understood by the ordinary reader as referring to any member of the group. But Storhaug speaks specifically in the quoted passage about ‘politicians’, about individuals with a special obligation to the group’s official ideology.
2) Storhaug does not deny that such ‘politicians’ can have their own opinions. She speaks of such own or “independent” opinions insofar as they are thought to be detached from a particular environment. She is not saying that one does not have independent opinions if (for example) one has the same opinion as the rest of the participants in a group, or an opinion that coincides with what one might expect from cultural coercion. Helland should explain how he can imagine that such a connection is at work here. A capitalist who in a given

situation lays off a number of workers in order to make money is doing what is culturally expected of him, but he also does it from an independent opinion. Of course.

3) And what about Helland? He expresses precisely the same opinions as Døving, Lars Gule, Hogne Øyan and several other fashion-conscious social scientists – to the extent that some will find it a little difficult to understand why he wanted to write his article at all. But the article does not cease to express independent opinions on the part of Helland for that reason, not to mention that it would make him a "dishonest" person.

4) Among other things, Helland could be thought to defend himself here by saying that he did not want to hide the fact that "representative" should mean the same as "politician" in the example above. There are at least two things to mention in this regard. A: Based on the technique in the rest of the article, there is little to indicate that he would have accepted such an apology if it had come from Storhaug in a similar situation. B: Helland is misguided when he thinks he can conclude that Storhaug implies that "no" representative (regardless of what he puts in the latter word) can free himself from cultural coercion. Helland can say something like this because he imagines that Storhaug has a general concept that leaves no room for exceptions, while at the same time he himself has no real general concepts at all.

The most important single point in Helland's list of objections, namely Storhaug's use of the indefinite plural in some contexts (cf. 117), is worthless as long as Helland 1) does not give any indication that he has tried to find examples of the use of more specific plural forms, and 2) as long as he actually uses quantity terms without knowing how to combine them into common concepts. Thus, there is also reason to assume that the examples of linguistic ambiguities that we have mentioned here should be sufficient to provide an adequate picture of Helland's practice in this field.

Footnotes

[1] References to page numbers go to Helland's article. Since I spend a lot of space pointing out that Helland operates with concepts that are not very justified, including "Islamophobia", I myself will, in this text, use the term "Islamophilia" as an imprecise, but in practical terms sufficiently guiding working name for a certain set of positions in the debate about "racism" in the Norwegian-language context.

[2] Another example than the one that follows in the text, and which is considerably more amusing, is Helland's formulations about how Spain gradually "conquered large parts of the Latin American continent" (120).

[3] However, please see the undersigned's *State, religion, economy*, Aschehoug 2002, as well as *The Left and Islam*, Valdisholm 2011.

[4] *Die Reformation des Münzwesens als Brücke zum sozialen Staat*, 1891. See also Guido G. Preparata: "On the art of innuendo: J. M. Keynes' plagiarism of Silvio Gesell's monetary economics", *Research in Political Economy*, Volume 20 (2001), pp. 217-253. See also Guenther Sandleben: "Herrschaft des Finanzkapitals? Versuch einer theoretischen Klärung", Berlin, 2015.

[5] See Sandemose 2002, cf. above. Let me add that in my opinion Keynes does not go far enough to be called racist – even if many think so.

[6] The so-called "Marxist Forlag" has recently published a book by Michael Heinrich in Swedish translation, *Introduction to the Three Volumes of Marx's Capital*, a central work in the development of Marx's theory of value, with an attempt to assert a Gesell-Keynesian understanding of money.

[7] Cf. Agora no. 2-3/2012, pp. 348-358; see not least p. 351.

[8] For a good explanation, from the side of a bourgeois economist, of the difference between absolute interest and current monopoly interest, see Saverio M. Fratini, S.M. 2009. "La rendita assoluta di Marx e le equazioni di prezzo di Sraffa". *Working Paper no 105*, Collana del Dipartimento di Economia, Università degli Studi Roma Tre, 2009.

[9] Cf. Sandemose 2011.

7. Migrants: Foreign classes on stage?

Some threads on [the forum] Verdidebatt are now fortunately starting to draw national as well as international class-relations into the migrant debate. It is worth taking a look at a strange article by the Slovenian psychologist Slavoj Zizek, recently.

***

The article has appeared in the twin magazines *Klassekampen* (September 12 [2015]) and *Le monde diplomatique*.[2]

It gives a good impression of how acute the intellectual crisis on the left really is. Seen from a classical socialist position (which would include Marxism), the post is to be regarded as a series of misunderstandings. It may seem that the same would apply from a general logical point of view. I will try to show why. The main point of view is then that today's migrant situation requires both historical insight and theory on the part of socialists.

We read in Zizek that "people in Africa and the Middle East will not be able to change their societies on their own.... Why not? Because we Western Europeans prevent them". Zizek believes he can substantiate these claims by giving a number of examples of Western intervention in so-called developing countries, which I will call "Asian" societies in this post, in line with the classical theory of "Asian" despotism or "Asian" societies. In Marx (and others), the "Asian" form of society, in South America, in Asia, in Africa or in the easternmost part of Europe, is a lower historical form than the feudal one, which we only know from Western Europe and Japan.

Zizek's claim is therefore that "we Western Europeans" are capable of determining the development in such "Asian" societies. But upheavals such as the one in Russia in 1917, in China in 1949, in Vietnam in 1954 (and many more in even more recent times), all of which were attempted to be "prevented" by Western powers, definitely indicate something else.

Contrary to Zizek's views, it can easily be stated that the reason for the inertia of Asian systems lies in these social structures themselves. Considering their undeveloped, non-capitalist character, this means that serious changes can only be implemented through land

[2]'We Can't Address the EU Refugee Crisis Without Confronting Global Capitalism'. The refugees won't all make it to Norway. Nor does the Norway they seek exist. Slavoj Žižek September 9, 2015 https://inthesetimes.com/article/slavoj-zizek-european-refugee-crisis-and-global-capitalism

reforms that shake up the basic property relations surrounding agriculture and animal husbandry. Changes in possible industrial forms will follow in their wake.

It is a completely different matter that Marx (and probably other theorists) have argued that positive and substantial changes to “Asian” societies can only come from outside – possibly precisely from bourgeois economies, and then in direct or indirect forms. It is therefore not entirely unreasonable to believe that Zizek turns things on their head in the most precise way.

'Asian' societies are permeated by an ideology we can call "despotic". This means that the subordinate producers, who we can call "status workers" (extreme variant: people have their professions determined through castes) are perceived as being placed in a god-given hierarchy, ruled by a god-pharaoh (Ramses II, Kim Jung Il, and so on). This is the superstructure of the rulers and justification for appropriating the surplus of production. But unfortunately, it is also largely the imagination of the subordinates. Substantial rebellions are far away in such cultures, regardless of whether they occur. Both rulers and the ruled are "despotic". Corruption here is not "corruption", but a fundamental structure.

It is interesting to see what happens at the moment Zizek is actually forced to realize this. He will content himself with creating new mystifications: He points out the unsavory demand mentality of migrants from Asian structures, and says: “There is something mysteriously utopian in this demand..... Precisely when people find themselves in poverty, need and danger, and one would think they would be content with a little security and well-being, the absolute utopia explodes.” The philosopher is clearly looking to speculate about the “eternal human nature” – a true astral body!

But it is not about “people” in general and abstractly, but rather about people from status societies, who are used to the world being kept going by “demands” independent of production and work – no matter how much those who make the demands are themselves subjected to forced labor! A good example of the differences here: See the Western media’s astonishment in connection with the Fukushima disaster: “Japanese refugees do not indulge in looting!” But this was predictable, because Japan has a special culture in the East, where capitalism is historically built on feudal, mutual loyalty relationships between people, like in Western Europe – something completely different from an “Asian” mode of production.

It is also a mistake when Zizek claims that in the world today we have a central movement towards slavery. It is a popular theme for PK [Norwegian: ‘politically correct’]-humanists: They find slaves everywhere. But on the contrary: The examples he gives, from Qatar and other luxury states in the Middle East, among others, are all typical of despotic conditions.

Stadium-builders in Qatar live in poverty and pigsties, but in fact they are wage-workers anyway. Real slavery is a Greco-Roman-European invention, which led to feudalism in Western Europe. However, it is in principle incompatible with despotic conditions, because slavery implies that the subjects of the pharaoh-despot can rule exclusively over slaves – which would reduce the scope of the despot's power.

What is striking here is that Zizek claims that "slavery was almost eradicated towards the end of the Middle Ages", while the correct thing is that it was destroyed with the decline of Antiquity, which was a prerequisite for the transition to feudal serfdom in Europe. It is equally wrong when he claims that modern slavery is "inherent in global capitalism", because he cannot provide any evidence that such a global system exists. Here we come to a common problem in almost everything that Zizek produces. These are misconceptions that – in his case – are linked to misunderstandings of Marx's, and (funnily enough) also of Hegel's system, something we will return to on another occasion.

Specifically, Zizek claims here that when the world has to fight through changes that "can remove the social conditions that create refugees", one must be aware that "the underlying cause of the refugee flow is today's global capitalism and its geopolitical games". This is and will remain an illusion. It is true that Western intervention has determined the timing of migrant flows. But the real basis lies in the social structure of the Asian despots, which prioritizes an economy based on immediate land ownership, on the exchange of already existing resources (not new production of resources), and thus also on warfare. Islam is the clearest expression of such ideology (sorry, worker-Brendberg). Again: It is a completely different matter that sparks from outside are needed to start upheavals in poor countries. But the spark must be able to start land reforms that have their basis in the despotisms themselves, and their possibilities for being abolished.

The Marxists' classic theory of stages of society probably still has a lot going for it. It implies, among other things, that the first question a migrant must ask must be: Why don't you stay home and fight for a better world? Much depends on the answer, whatever it may be.

All in all: When we think about the fact that migration today means that completely new class relations are being brought into Western societies, we can perhaps agree with Eivind Reitan, who on another thread has pointed out the possibility that Western workers' interests can come together with Western bourgeois interests on a certain level – against all despotism.

8. Xenophobia among immigrants

A call to Mobasheri – and to Thomassen

***

From 18 November [2015] onward, I made a few comments on the "Rødt"-activists Siavash Mobasheri and his helper Turid Thomassen. Their membership in the right-wing "Rødt"-coalition, combined with the title of this post of mine, immediately gives the reader a good idea of what kind of issues we are facing.

What Mobasheri achieved in his post "Increasing xenophobia, the result of a class-divided society", was a recitation of certain socialist perceptions of the background for the stupidity of the working class. The theory is perfectly fine, as far as it is relevant. As I pointed out, Mobasheri also made a good point about some features of Karl Marx's theory of the "industrial reserve army" to justify why the Norwegian poor, who are oppressed under the typical capitalist "unemployment mechanism", easily feel discriminated against by immigrant workers.

But I found it striking that the Rødt-socialists took issue only with the working class's skepticism towards immigration, and the "xenophobia" this would entail. I therefore asked them to explain this, especially the xenophobia that seems to be relatively common among people who immigrate from the so-called "third world". I pointed out that in the wake of the events in Paris in November [2015], it was quite strange to keep such matters quiet.

What Mobasheri was trying to do was, in practice, to apply a kind of class analysis to the question of xenophobia. But he only addressed certain aspects of class relations within Western nations (especially petty-bourgeois and proletarian forms of reaction), without at all taking the class positions of immigrants up for discussion. What on earth could this be due to? Basically, it suggests discrimination against people of foreign cultures. What does it look like in depth?

My own opinion, after countless meetings and encounters with "new compatriots" in equally countless types of situations (in Norway and other areas of Western Europe), is that they are above average represented among brash, arrogant and sometimes violent drivers (bus and taxi) and regular traffic otherwise, and that a similar number have tendencies to seek out illegal business operations, or also overtime work in industrial workplaces. Furthermore, it is unfortunately strikingly common that you are tried to be cheated out of change over the

counter when the staffing is accordingly. It is not only among ethnic Norwegians that we find meanness and petty attitudes, as one might think after reading Mobasheri and Thomassen – no matter how apt their description is.

To approach a serious discussion, we must obtain a reliable picture of what non-capitalist societies look like in today's world. In terms of population, most people live in states that are built up by systems of status work (the very worst: the caste system) and clan systems. However, some live in units that are state only formally, especially in central Africa. But here the societies act as imitations of the more consolidated state societies: status discriminations, clan relations and primitive economic structures dominate.

Typical of *all* these societies, state or placebo-state, is that they are dominated by collective principles, not by developed and systematic private property, as Western societies are. The latter are founded on the destruction of old collective principles. The former are based on them all the time. A good example is how “Eastern” or “Oriental” despots are careful to conform to inefficient working principles in order to survive. Emperor Caracalla in ancient Rome refused to use advanced hoisting machinery in the construction of his magnificent palaces, because “then my little people will have nothing to do”. Joseph Stalin bowed down to the old mir-system from 1930 on, and allowed it to survive fully in the new factories. The result was inertia and lack of discipline, where workers retained their old collective solidarity based on an implicit agreement to keep the pace slow so as not to betray the collective to the leader, – a system that also served to make the working class accept that a police state prevailed in public life, outside the factory walls. At the same time, Stalin tried to appear “Marxist”; nothing could be further from reality, for in Marx it is capitalism's historical implementation of the discipline of labor that makes it progressive, and allows it to lay the foundation for an advanced, new collective that builds on the historical efforts of private property.

Stalin and Caracalla are nothing more than puppets for the old systems, which are essentially the same as those we encounter in today's "Third World". The example of the Stalinist system is interesting for us today because it is related to the "communism" that was developed in Western Europe, and which became more and more stupid, also in terms of its development after Gorbachev.

This shows that "Third World attitudes" are not reserved for people from less developed societies, but also represents a phenomenon that is more or less common to all. Why was Stalinist socialism accepted in the West at all? Quite certainly because among both workers and leftist intellectuals there was – and still is – a fear of carrying out a consistent struggle for

liberation. If it is the case that one feels that one must do something for a better world, one can also secretly be afraid of the professional and existential consequences for oneself. A Caracalla socialism is a perfect solution – for a while. In the Soviet Union, the workers felt that they had power over the bureaucracy, without having to go so far as to systematically revolt. But this is only possible for a short while. The Soviet economy collapsed through waste and lack of discipline, and even the divided freedom could not be maintained over time. Many Russian workers see this clearly today – but in reality the economy is the same as before.

Western European workers and intellectuals romantically joined the seemingly contented Russian proletarians – and lost all ability for objective analysis. From 1860, Karl Marx had pointed out that the "Russian gendarme" was the darkest reactionary force in Europe. Intellectual "communists" could not see that something similar was becoming the case with the Soviet Union, especially after the Second World War.

When one takes this intellectual heritage into account, it is certainly not strange that the same type of intellectual today joins precisely as uncritically the despotic "poor people" who are now migrating into Western Europe. Whoever does not understand history is condemned to relive it, we know.

Moreover, the amputated positions of Mobasheris and Thomassen are precisely linked to the horror of what would happen if a truly revolutionary thought won the hegemony in the labor movement. The "Rødt"-party is devoid of understanding of the position of the working class. The handful of advanced communist workers and shop stewards who exist there today should resign, in order to make an effective effort from a common and more independent position.

The half-heartedness of Soviet "workerism" corresponded to a bureaucratic, bullying, servile layer of the upper class – not so different from what was the case in Tsarist times. In the first volume of Capital (1867), Marx wrote that Russian industrialists were not up to their job. "Like masters, so dogs" – that is a polite comment! At the same time (1858) he wrote that the Russian worker was like a barbarian compared to the Westerner. As everyone understands, Stalin and the Soviet Bolshevik Party strove to keep this hidden from the masses!

But what about the xenophobia of immigrants in Western Europe, with which we began? What seems clear is that among them we find above-average arrogance (a sense of inferiority), and so on. They are reminiscent of the former Soviets, that much seems clear. Ethnic Norwegians most often perceive these attitudes as directed against themselves. But are we really right in this? Isn't it rather the case that Third World people are tormented and

tormented into a state of lack of perspective and political passivity – which makes it reasonable to emigrate from the problems? And isn't this attitude also an internal phenomenon in the Third World, so that it is imprecise to call it “xenophobia”?

You see, such matters could have been well raised in a dialogue. But Mobasheri quickly withdrew. I don't know if he himself can be called an immigrant, but it is certain that his style is reminiscent of the arrogant form of debate we know from immigrant groups – often when immigrants speak in trade unions or in newspaper columns: Far too many like to present themselves as victims in relation to ethnic Europeans. (Type: Ali Esbati.) I think we would do well to consider whether it is not the other way around: They have gotten away with it easily, while we in the West must continue a serious revolutionary struggle, from which they too will benefit.

9. Placebos in various forms

Should there also be a placebo-racism?

***

The stronger the capitalist crisis unfolds, the more the [attitude of] Islamic strangeness towards “Western values” will be reaffirmed and made righteous – both “abroad” and “at home”. The clearer it will also become that capital’s selection-mechanisms for the labor market will have a discriminatory effect on immigrants. Thus, the cultural contradictions will increase further, and we will have, – as many have already predicted, – civil war-like conditions.

To master such situations, a lot of praxis is needed, but no less theory. Anyone who wants to change the situation, and the conditions it has, must have a complete overview of history. And anyone who does not want to acquire it, probably does not really want to improve the state of the world.

The increasing unemployment during crisis directly points to the decisive difference between capitalist societies and less developed societies, such as Hindu and Islamic ones. In the latter type of society, social change, and the little dynamism that exists, is tied to slow landed property and biological factors in the broad sense. First and foremost, it is the development of the population of [such forms of] society, its changes forward and back, that determines its development. Hence also their tendency toward conquest, and also to mass murder. One could say that population development is an “independent variable”.

With capitalism, this tendency was broken. The bourgeoisie built a society based on a freer development of productive forces, no longer rigidly bound to the limitations of nature, but to the development of industry. But because this industry is and was based on private property, it creates production crises, and an “industrial reserve army” of permanently and temporarily unemployed arises. These can be drawn into production as soon as labor becomes cheaper as a result of the crisis – and the round dance starts again in a new cycle, and so on.

This means that bourgeois society has no overpopulation problem, other than the one it creates periodically.

Since this characteristic is the most important distinction in relation to older forms of society, it also characterizes the situation today, where older societies come into contact with

capitalist countries and states. In such older forms, the phenomenon of "overpopulation" is present as a biological reproductive factor, which cannot be dampened by the economic system. This is clearly seen with the Pakistani example: At the latest from around 1980, the immigration of Pakistani citizens to the Nordic countries took on more and more the character of being a phenomenon sponsored by the state apparatus in Islamabad. It ceased to be a "worker migration", and became a migration of petty bourgeoisie, accepted by the states as a method to import a strong, Western [Scandinavian] krone-currency. To put it bluntly: Nordic welfare money finances a rotten, domestic [Pakistani] economy, which also depends on cheap arms credits from Western imperialists.

The reason in the ultimate instance was, that the domestic system could be threatened by overpopulation and unrest. It needed safety-valves. In a Western, bourgeois system, however, this would have been intercepted in fluctuations in the labor market.

Western bureaucrats did not understand a peep of the consequences – just as little as [Labour Party leader Jonas] Støre and his friends understood what they were doing when they bombed Libya. On the contrary, they have welcomed immigration, promoted by Eastern states, as a guarantee of increased trade and investment towards Asian areas. In addition to being hostages to Allah, the ruthless desert god, immigrants are now trapped in a demand to act in solidarity with Nordic state apparatuses that they have good reason to despise.

The bourgeoisie's political line towards immigration, with ghetto-building and false integration, is based on an ignorance as great as that we encounter among the various "scientists" that the same bourgeoisie has employed to spread the humanitarian-regime [on 'godhetsregimet', see Terje Tvedt] across the land and sea. This applies whether they choose to reveal themselves on Verdidebatt, or prefer other channels.

Both parties are forced to overlook that the current wave of immigration is largely a result of Islamic dominance in Eastern states representing an oppressive class-power that can only be abolished through radical land reforms and, – in the even longer term, – anti-religious work. Such realizations are far too dangerous for placebo-researchers and puppet ministers. Therefore, these two actors are frantically dedicated to muddy any approach to a debate with distortions, outright falsehoods, or with telling silence. The traditional, "well-behaved" academic fields are also now in the process of rotting away, and are populated by sycophants who sacrifice much to retain their privileges.

A sign of the times is that "research centers" with religious affiliations are gaining university status; and the muddying of theory-construction is becoming correspondingly prominent.

One of the best examples – but far from the only one – is that the term “racism” is being redefined to mean a whole range of cultural contradictions. The placebo-researchers are actually saying outright that they are unhappy that real racism is on the way out. They want to keep their curse word at all costs.
And such people should act as society’s new analysts!